

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting January 19, 2006 Stephen P. Clark Center 111 NW 1st Street 19th floor conference room 8:00 AM

Summary of Meeting

CAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robin Reiter, Chairwoman Jose Andreu, Vice Chairperson Elio Alfonso Barbara Bisno

Guy Forchion Wendell A. James George Lindemann Jose Antonio Martinez Jeffrey Mishcon Ann Pope Alan Rubin Juan T. Sanchez

Esther Smith Fano James Wise

Lucas Rincon, CDM

OTHERS PRESENT:

George M. Burgess, County Manager Bill Johnson, Assistant County Manager

Gerald Heffernan, Assistant County Attorney Geri Bonzon-Keenan, Assistant County Attorney

Roger T. Hernstadt, Director, OCI Dan Wall, Assistant Director, OSBM George Navarrete, OCI

Jose A. Galan, OCI Bernard McGriff, OCI Jackie Bofill, OCI

Roslyn Alic-Batson, OCI

Ana Watson, OCI

Lorraine Guevara, OCI Robert Villar, Mayor's Office Michael Alvarez, MDPD Maggie Tawil, MDPR Jorge Mora, MDPR Elva Marin, GSA William Pupo, GSA

Vernita Nelson, City of Miami Gardens

The Citizens' Advisory Committee meeting was convened at 8:10 AM on Thursday, January 19, 2006.

Ms. Robin Reiter, Chairperson of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, welcomed everyone and asked all Members to particularly note Agenda Item IV. All CAC members are required to attend the Miami Dade County Ethics training by the end of February 2006. If the members do not take the mandatory training, they can be asked to resign.

Ms. Reiter then called for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2005, meeting. Mr. Alan Rubin moved for approval, was seconded by Jeffrey Mishcon and the minutes were approved with one correction, which noted that Ms. Ann Pope was present at the November meeting.

Ms. Reiter then called for citizens' presentations. As no one stepped forward, she suggested that there would be a second opportunity for public comments prior to the end of the meeting.

Ms. Reiter asked Mr. Roger Hernstadt to present the Program Status Report. He mentioned that Agenda, Items V. 1 and 2 gave the accomplishments and recommendations for the use of the premium funds that were from the first bond sale, which would be discussed later. He noted that per the request from the last CAC meeting, the Office of Capital Improvements (OCI) staff met with the CAC Sub-Committee to discuss what was being done to monitor the program and the methodology to ensure that the stakeholders were moving the program forward. Ms. Reiter then requested that Mr. Alan Rubin report on the sub-committee meeting.

Mr. Rubin reported that the OCI staff gave an instructive presentation on how they review, coordinate, design and compile the priority of the projects and the status. He expressed that the sub-committee felt very comfortable with what was presented at the December 8, 2005, meeting. Mr. Rubin explained that the computer program, Capital Improvements Information System (CIIS), evaluates and tracks the status of the program, which was based on the input from the various departments. Staff is able to observe the beginning, the middle and the end of the process of all of the projects within the bond program. Staff can evaluate how much money has been spent, where the money has gone, the status of the project and what the overall program looks like. Mr. Rubin noted that the reports would be provided to the members on a regular basis so that they could evaluate the program in its entirety. He also noted that the sub-committee was very comfortable with the tracking measurements and how the reports were presented. Each project that was included in the bond program would follow this plan. He then requested that staff continue with the presentation.

Ms. Reiter noted that at the last CAC meeting, some members expressed concern as to how the progress of the projects would be tracked and how staff would report to the CAC. At the same meeting, Mr. Hernstadt and Mr. Navarrete had explained that OCI had an oversight program already in existence. That was why the sub-committee was requested to meet with staff and review it. Ms. Reiter inquired how the staff would keep the members informed on the different stages of progress in a project. Mr. Hernstadt explained that OCI had requested to provide the members access to the CIIS system. Until that was established, the OCI staff would provide the information through reports to the CAC.

Ms. Alic-Batson gave an overview of the program and what it consisted of. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Hernstadt noted that municipalities and stakeholders have to report to OCI in the

same manner as county departments. He also mentioned that that the OCI staff would periodically check the status of the projects out in the field. Ms. Reiter inquired as to how the OCI office would ensure that the municipality utilized the bond funds for the intended purpose. Mr. Hernstadt explained that the funds were given on a reimbursement basis. Mr. Rubin noted that no one gets the money upfront. Mr. Lindemann pointed out that there were many checks and balances, which were discussed at the sub-committee meeting. During the presentation, Mr. Hernstadt explained that each milestone that was viewed on-screen had a scheduled start and completion date. He noted that as suggested at the last CAC meeting, the red, yellow and green process would be utilized. If a project was within 90-days it would show as green; more than 90-days yellow; and more than 180-days red. Ms. Reiter then asked if the OCI office would provide an exception report containing the over 90-days and 180-days to the CAC members. Mr. Hernstadt informed her that yes that would be provided.

Ms. Reiter introduced and welcomed County Manager, George Burgess, who was present as an observer.

Ms. Reiter then asked the Committee what timeframe they want to see the report; 90-days or 180-days. Mr. Rubin suggested that the 180-day mark would be a better exception report. Mr. Juan Sanchez then requested to know how the CAC would assist if a project falls into default. Ms. Reiter explained that the CAC would help provide oversight and direction. She suggested that if something were six months overdue, staff would bring it to the attention of the committee and provide an update as to why that had happened. At that point, the CAC would make a recommendation that the project may not happen in the series and could be pushed into later years. Once it was reviewed, then staff would recommend that something else in the program be moved forward and feedback would be provided. A brief discussion ensued. As the CIIS presentation continued, Ms. Reiter suggested that any member who would like a more detailed explanation on the CIIS system could contact Ms. Alic-Batson.

Ms. Reiter noted Agenda Item V. 3b and thanked staff for providing the table of organization. She then introduced Mr. Dan Wall, so that he could give an overview of the non-for-profit funds.

Mr. Burgess thanked the CAC members for their assistance. Ms. Reiter requested that the CAC members be provided with access to the building prior to 8AM, so that the meeting would be convened on schedule. Mr. Burgess suggested that the members be given a badge for early access to the building.

Mr. Wall presented a brief outline on the \$30 million Non-Profit Capital Fund. He noted that the application to apply for funds would be available for 120-days in which during that period the Office of Strategic Business Management (OSBM) planned on conducting two pre-proposal conferences. One would be at the beginning of the 120-days and the second would be later in that period to ensure that everyone was given the opportunity to submit an application. OSBM recommended a 3-tier structure for the application based on the size of the proposing organizations annual operating budget. Small organizations having a total annual operating budget of under \$1 million dollars would not be required to provide a match and would have an approximate award cap of \$500,000 of the \$30 million in the Fund. The cap would be for each applicant. Ms. Reiter suggested that Mr. Wall check with Internal Revenue Services with the smaller organizations to ensure that the County grants did not jeopardize the organization's public charity status. Medium sized organizations that have a total annual operating budget from \$1 million to \$5 million, OSBM

recommended that there be a one dollar match for every two dollars in GOB funding, with an approximate award cap of \$1 million of the \$30 million in the Fund. Large organizations with a total annual operating budget of over \$5 million would have a dollar for dollar match, with an approximate award cap of \$2.5 million of the \$30 million in the Fund.

Mr. Wall noted that OSBM would consider placing on the application the ability to waive those caps. That would be for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to decide to waive the caps as needed. He also mentioned that OSBM was considering various guidelines. Mr. Wall then explained that OSBM had considered establishing a minimum allocation goal of some percentage of the total dollars available from the \$30 million for small organizations. This was due to OSBM having recognized the inability or difficulty of some of those small organizations to compete with the larger more established ones.

Mr. Wall explained that the applications would be evaluated and rated by a selection committee, which would make recommendations for funding to the County Manager. The County Manager would then make his recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) through the CAC, GOB sub-committee, and the appropriate committees of the BCC. He noted that proposals that met the minimum threshold in terms of scoring would remain on the eligibility list for a period of up to five years. Mr. Wall then handed out a draft evaluation to all members present. (Attachment A.)

Mr. Bill Johnson noted that recommendations for committees would be made to the County Manager, but ultimately the manager appoints the committees. Ms. Reiter then asked if someone from the CAC would be able to serve on the non-for-profit selection committee to represent the CAC. Mr. Gerald Heffernan and Ms. Geri Bonzon-Keenan from the county attorney's office recommended reviewing the conflict policy prior to determining if that was possible. Subsequent to the meeting, the county attorney's office indicated that a CAC member could sit on a selection committee. Mr. Wall noted that OSBM anticipated having some non-county participants serve on the selection committee.

Mr. Juan Sanchez wanted to clarify that the Miami Art Museum and the Museum of Science are not part of the Non-Profit Capital Fund. Ms. Reiter and Mr. Wall confirmed that statement. Mr. Wall also mentioned that OSBM anticipated including language on the application that would inform the applicant or proposing organization that if they were already obtaining another bond program application they would not be considered for the non-for-profit fund.

Mr. Sanchez noted that he was concerned that funds given to the non-for-profit organizations would be risky without the supervision of the county. Mr. Hernstadt responded that the county was very involved in the process in its entirety and indicated that there would be a difference between grant agreements with a small organization as opposed to one of the larger projects. Mr. Johnson then gave a brief explanation of the process to the members. A brief discussion ensued. He noted that county government along with the oversight committee would be part of the process for the bond program projects. Ms. Reiter mentioned that the CAC would also like to hear a presentation from the Miami Art Museum and the Museum of Science stakeholders. Mr. Rubin also mentioned that Cooper Robinson, one of the urban planners of the park would be conducting a public meeting through the City of Miami for all citizens interested in obtaining more information on the project. Mr. Johnson then noted that the agreements with the Miami Art Museum and the Museum of Science would clearly spell out that the county had the legal right to step in to remedy any deficiency. Ms.

Reiter also noted that the course of the bond program, which had been approved by the voters, could not be changed.

Ms. Reiter then addressed the action item Agenda item V 1. This item was a recommendation to take some of the premium funds from the first bond sale, \$3.125 million for land acquisition to house the new NorthSide police station, new Community Action Agency (CAA) regional headstart facility and a new public library, as well as accelerating funding \$2.71 million for the Tropical American exhibit construction at Metrozoo. Ms. Reiter called for a motion to approve. Mr. Rubin moved for approval, was seconded by Ms. Sylvia Person. A brief discussion ensued. Motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Reiter then asked the members present if meeting every other month was sufficient at this point in time, the members present agreed. It was concluded that the next CAC meeting would be in March at 8AM.

Meeting was adjourned at 10 AM.